



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/823,324	03/30/2001	Wei-Quiang Michael Guo	MS158494.1 (4935)	8113

321 7590 07/15/2004

SENNIGER POWERS LEAVITT AND ROEDEL
ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE
16TH FLOOR
ST LOUIS, MO 63102

EXAMINER

COFFY, EMMANUEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

DATE MAILED: 07/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/823,324

Applicant(s)

GUO ET AL.

Examiner

Emmanuel Coffy

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 11 and 32 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the application filed on 30 March 2001. Claims 1-42 are pending. Claims 1-42 are directed to a system, software and method for "Service Routing and Web Integration in a Distributed Multi-Site User Authentication System."

Claim Objections

2. Claims 8, 12, 16-21, 26-27, 29, 33 and 37-38 are objected to because of the following minor informalities. Appropriate correction is required.

They are dependent claims, which claim dependency on 1, 8, and 22. A claim that depends from a dependent claim should not be separated by any claim that does not also depend from said dependent claim. It should be kept in mind that a dependent claim may refer to any preceding independent claim. In general applicant's sequence will not be changed. See MPEP §608.01(n).

3. Claims 11 and 32 are objected to for depending upon a rejected claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nessett et al. (US 6,055,236) in view of Springer et al. (US 6,321,262.)

Claim 1:

Claim 1 recites a computerized method of routing between network servers coupled to a data communication network, said method comprising: storing information in a central database for identifying locations of a plurality of network servers that provide at least one service via the data communication network, said central database being coupled to a central server, said central server being coupled to the data communication network; receiving a request from the user for a selected service to be provided by one of the network servers, said request being received at the central server and including a carry through keyword for controlling routing of the user to the selected service; retrieving location information from the central database to identify the location of the network server providing the selected service; attaching the carry through keyword to the retrieved location information; and routing the user to the network server providing the selected service, said user being directed to the selected service based on the carry through keyword.

Nessett teaches a method for allowing services to be identified on an internal distributed network. Furthermore, Nessett teaches the creation of a digital certificate to identify the service on an internal network device (server). (See col. 5, lines 6-11).

Nessett also discloses a method for requesting services to be provided by a network device.

Nessett does not suggest the authentication of a user and carrying through the keyword. However, Springer explicitly teaches the use of a system express service code as the unique key to match up to the customer information recorded at the time of the order. (See col. 3, lines 41-48).

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the use of locating a service as taught by Nessett ('236) with the user's identification system as disclosed by Springer ('262).

Such system provides for tracking a customer automatically and properly identifies customer's equipment. The user enjoys custom tailored service at lower cost. Therefore, claim 1 is rejected.

Claim 2:

Claim 2 recites the method of claim 1 further comprising storing authentication information in the central database for authenticating the user.

Nessett does not suggest the storage of authentication information in a database. However, Springer explicitly teaches storing a customer's identification number in a database at col. 3, lines 24-32.

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the use of locating a service as taught by Nessett ('236) with storing the user's identification system as disclosed by Springer ('262).

Such system provides for tracking a customer automatically and properly identifies customer's equipment. The user enjoys custom tailored service at lower cost. Therefore, claim 2 is rejected.

Claim 3:

Claim 3 recites the method of claim 2 further comprising receiving a request at the central server to authenticate the user when the user requests the selected service and authenticating the user by determining whether the user was already authenticated and, if the user was not already authenticated, then retrieving login information from the user for comparison to authentication information stored in the central database.

Nessett does not suggest this authentication process. However, Springer explicitly teaches such authentication process at col. 3, lines 13-48.

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the use of locating a service as taught by Nessett ('236) with the authentication process as disclosed by Springer ('262).

Such system incorporates a robust authentication process.

Therefore, claim 2 is rejected.

Claim 4:

Claim 4 recites the method of claim 3 wherein the user is routed to the network server providing the selected service after the user is authenticated by the central server.

Nessett does not suggest routing to the network server providing the selected service after the user is authenticated by the central server. However, Springer explicitly teaches routing to the network server providing the selected service after the user is authenticated by the central server at col. 3, line 49 - col.4, line 10.

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the use of locating a service as taught by Nessett ('236) with routing to the network server as disclosed by Springer ('262).

Such system provides for tracking a customer automatically and properly identifies customer's equipment. The user enjoys custom tailored service at lower cost. Therefore, claim 4 is rejected.

Claim 5:

Claim 5 recites the method of claim 1 wherein the carry through keyword references content associated with the selected service provided by the network server.

Nessett does not suggest that the carry through keyword references content associated with the selected service provided by the network server. However, Springer explicitly teaches the carry through keyword references content associated with the selected service provided by the network server at col. 4, line 64 - 67.

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the use of locating a service as taught by Nessett ('236) with the carry through keyword referencing content associated with the selected service provided by the network server as disclosed by Springer ('262).

Such system provides for tracking a customer automatically and properly identifies customer's equipment. The user enjoys custom tailored service at lower cost. Therefore, claim 5 is rejected.

Claim 6:

Claim 6 recites the method of claim 1 further comprising storing user-specific information in the central database for identifying the user and wherein the carry through keyword is based on the user-specific information.

This claim is rejected for the same reasons as those articulated in claim 2 above.

Claim 7:

Claim 7 recites the method of claim 6 wherein the user-specific information includes user and domain names for the user.

Nessett does not suggest that the user-specific information includes user and domain names for the user. However, Springer explicitly teaches the user-specific information includes user and domain names for the user at col. 3, line 49 – col. 3, line 8.

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the use of locating a service as taught by Nessett ('236) with the carry through keyword referencing content associated with the user specific information including domain names as disclosed by Springer ('262).

Such system provides for tracking a customer automatically and properly identifies customer's equipment. The user enjoys custom tailored service at lower cost. Therefore, claim 7 is rejected.

Claim 8:

Claim 8 recites the method of claim 1 further comprising identifying the selected service with a service routing request keyword included in the service request received at the central server.

Nessett does not suggest identifying the selected service with a service routing request keyword included in the service request received at the central server. However, Springer explicitly teaches that concept col. 5, lines 12 – 15.

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the use of locating a service as taught by Nessett ('236) with the carry through keyword referencing content associated with identifying the selected service with a service routing request keyword as disclosed by Springer ('262).

Such system provides for tracking a customer automatically and properly identifies customer's equipment. The user enjoys custom tailored service at lower cost. Therefore, claim 8 is rejected.

Claim 9:

Claim 9 recites the method of claim 8 wherein at least one of the network servers is a portal for providing the user with a gateway to the services provided by the network servers, and further comprising routing the user from the portal to the central server with the carry through keyword for controlling routing of the user and with the service routing request keyword for identifying the selected service when the user requests the selected service.

Nessett extensively teaches this concept as captured by Fig. 25,26,27.

Such system provides for tracking a customer automatically and properly identifies customer's equipment. The user enjoys custom tailored service at lower cost. Therefore, claim 9 is rejected.

Claim 10:

Claim 10 recites the method of claim 8 further comprising transferring additional data with the retrieved location information as a function of the service routing request keyword.

Nessett does not suggest transferring additional data with the retrieved location information. However, Springer explicitly teaches that concept col. 5, lines 35 – 37.

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the use of locating a service as taught by Nessett ('236) with the carry through keyword referencing content associated with identifying the selected service with transferring additional data with the retrieved location information as disclosed by Springer ('262).

Such system provides for tracking a customer automatically and properly identifies customer's equipment. The user enjoys custom tailored service at lower cost. Therefore, claim 10 is rejected.

Claim 12:

Claim 12 recites the method of claim 1 further comprising identifying the user with a domain name and wherein the location information is retrieved from the central database as a function of the domain name for the user.

This claim is rejected for the same reasons articulated in claim 7 above.

Claim 13:

Claim 13 recites the method of claim 12 further comprising identifying a plurality of providers of the selected service, permitting the user to select one of the identified

plurality of providers for receiving the selected service, and routing the user to the network server of the selected one of the identified plurality of providers of the selected service.

Nessett teaches a method for allowing services to be identified on an internal distributed network. Furthermore, Nessett teaches the creation of a digital certificate to identify the service on an internal network device (server). (See col. 5, lines 6-11). Nessett also discloses a method for routing the user to the network server of the selected one of the identified plurality of providers of the selected service. (See col. 3, lines 20-23 and 45-48).

Such system provides for tracking a customer automatically and properly identifies customer's equipment. The user enjoys custom tailored service at lower cost. Therefore, claim 13 is rejected.

Claim 14:

Claim 14 recites the method of claim 13 wherein the identified plurality of providers of the selected service are based on the domain name for the user.

Nessett teaches a method for allowing services to be identified on an internal distributed network. Furthermore, Nessett teaches the creation of a digital certificate to identify the service on an internal network device (server). (See col. 5, lines 6-11). Nessett also discloses a method for routing the user to the network server of the selected one of the identified plurality of providers of the selected service. (See col. 3, lines 20-23 and 45-48).

Nessett does not suggest using the domain name for the user in identifying the selected service provider. However, Springer explicitly teaches using the domain name for the user in identifying the selected service provider at col. 3, line 49 – col. 3, line 8.

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the use of locating a service as taught by Nessett ('236) with the carry through keyword referencing content associated with the user specific information including domain names as disclosed by Springer ('262).

Such system provides for tracking a customer automatically and properly identifies customer's equipment. The user enjoys custom tailored service at lower cost. Therefore, claim 14 is rejected.

Claim 15:

Claim 15 recites the method of claim 13 further comprising storing a user profile in the central database, said user profile including user preference information with respect to the identified plurality of providers of the selected service.

Nessett does not suggest storing a user profile in the central database, said user profile including user preference information with respect to the identified plurality of providers of the selected service. However, Springer explicitly teaches that concept col. 4, lines 35 – 38.

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the use of locating a service as taught by Nessett ('236) with storing a user profile in the central database, said user profile including user

preference information with respect to the identified plurality of providers of the selected service as disclosed by Springer ('262).

Such system provides for tracking a customer automatically and properly identifies customer's equipment. The user enjoys custom tailored service at lower cost. Therefore, claim 10 is rejected.

Claim 16:

Claim 16 recites the method of claim 1 further comprising identifying a plurality of providers of the selected service with a service routing request keyword included in the service request received at the central server.

Nessett teaches a method for allowing services to be identified on an internal distributed network. Furthermore, Nessett teaches the creation of a digital certificate to identify the service on an internal network device (server). (See col. 5, lines 6-11). Nessett also discloses a method for routing the user to the network server of the selected one of the identified plurality of providers of the selected service. (See col. 3, lines 20-23 and 45-48).

Nessett does not suggest the authentication of a user and carrying through the keyword. However, Springer explicitly teaches the use of a system express service code as the unique key to match up to the customer information recorded at the time of the order. (See col. 3, lines 41-48).

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the use of locating a service as taught by Nessett ('236) with the user's identification system as disclosed by Springer ('262).

Such system provides for tracking a customer automatically and properly identifies customer's equipment. The user enjoys custom tailored service at lower cost. Therefore, claim 16 is rejected.

Claim 17:

Claim 17 recites the method of claim 1 wherein storing information in the central database for identifying the locations of the network servers includes registering the network servers with the central server.

Nessett teaches the concept of a central server in a distributed network. (See col. 7, lines 8-32). Nessett does not suggest storing information in the central database for identifying the locations of the network servers. However, Springer teaches storing information in a database at col. 3, lines 14-17.

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the use of a central server as taught by Nessett ('236) with storing information in a database as disclosed by Springer ('262).

Such system provides for tracking a customer automatically and properly identifies customer's equipment. The user enjoys custom tailored service at lower cost. Therefore, claim 17 is rejected.

Claim 18:

Claim 18 recites the method of claim 1 further comprising operating a browser program configured to permit the user to communicate on the data communication network.

Nessett does not suggest operating a browser program. However, Springer explicitly teaches operating a browser program configured to permit the user to communicate on the data communication network at col. 3, line 49 – col. 3, line 8.

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the use of locating a service as taught by Nessett ('236) with operating a browser program configured to permit the user to communicate on the data communication network as disclosed by Springer ('262).

Such system provides for tracking a customer automatically and properly identifies customer's equipment. The user enjoys custom tailored service at lower cost. Therefore, claim 18 is rejected.

Claim 19:

Claim 19 recites the method of claim 1 wherein the network servers are web servers and the data communication network is the Internet.

Nessett explicitly discloses the use of the Internet at col. 1, lines 18-67.

Such system provides for a global tracking system. The user enjoys can access services from anywhere in the world.

Therefore, claim 19 is rejected.

Claim 20:

Claim 20 recites the method of claim 1 wherein the method is performed by the central server.

Nessett explicitly teaches this limitation at col. 40, lines 53-55.

Art Unit: 2157

Claim 21:

Claim 21 recites a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the method of claim 1.

Nessett explicitly teaches this limitation at col. 39, lines 62-64.

It is implicit that a computer requires software to operate. Hence, claim 21 is rejected.

Claims 22-42

These claims do not teach or define any significantly new limitation above and beyond claims 1-21 to warrant particular treatment, and are therefore further rejected for similar reasons.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


- Freen et al. (U.S. 5,959,985) teaches "Multi-Network Architecture."
- Lo et al. (U.S. 5,999,603) teaches "Method and Apparatus for Providing Multi-Network Virtual Services."
- Tsou et al. (U.S. 6,578,199) teaches "Automatic Tracking System and Method for Distributable Software."

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Emmanuel Coffy whose telephone number is (703) 305-0325. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (703) 308-7562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Emmanuel Coffy
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2157

EC
July 1, 2004



SALEH NAJJAR
PRIMARY EXAMINER